

REC'D DEC 01 2008

# Consolidation Plan

Final & Submitted Copy

# REORGANIZATION PLAN SUBMITTAL SHEET

(Each municipality in a School Union must be indicated separately.)

School Administrative Units Included in APPROVED Notice of Intent	School Administrative Units Submitting Reorganization Plan
MSAD #44	MSAD #44
RANGELEY	RANGELEY
GILEAD	GILEAD
UPTON	UPTON
DALLAS PLANTATION	DALLAS PLANTATION
SANDY RIVER PLANTATION	SANDY RIVER PLANTATION
RANGELEY PLANTATION	RANGELEY PLANTATION
MAGALLOWAY PLANTATION	MAGALLOWAY PLANTATION
LINCOLN PLANTATION	LINCOLN PLANTATION

## Contact Information:

RPC Chair

Name:

SIDNEY PEW

Address:

1003 FARMERS HILL RD  
POB 592

Telephone:

EAST ANDOVER, ME 04226

email:

207-392-1301  
KINGKONG@MEGALINK.NET

Date Plan Submitted:

NOVEMBER 7, 2008

Proposed RSU Operational Date:

JULY 1, 2009

<u>Siam J. Paw</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/6/08</u> Date	<u>SAD 44</u> SAU
<u>Kitha Parvith</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>Anderson/SAD 44</u> SAU
<u>Yvonne A. Rizzo</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>SAD 44/Bethel</u> SAU
<u>Robert H. Saylor</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>SAD 44/Bethel</u> SAU
<u>Virgil C. Wright</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>Newry/SAD 44</u> SAU
<u>Ronald T. Tegan</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/6/08</u> Date	<u>SAD 44</u> SAU
<u>Paul A. Henderson</u> Signature/Title	<u>11,6,08</u> Date	<u>SAD 44</u> SAU
<u>Richard Melville</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/06/08</u> Date	<u>SAD # 44</u> SAU
<u>Imro Holt</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/06/08</u> Date	<u>SAD # 44</u> SAU
<u>Bruce Murphy</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>SAD # 44 Newry</u> SAU
<u>Mary Ellen Harter</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>SAD # 44 Woodstock</u> SAU
<u>Brynley Smith</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-6-08</u> Date	<u>Union 37 Rangely Pit</u> SAU

<u>Al Ferguson</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>Sandy River</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>Carmen P. Giddens</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>SANDY RIVER</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>Bruce Boan</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>Magalloway P.H.</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>James L. Jones</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>SAD #414</u> <u>Newry</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>W. H. Schaefer</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>Rangely</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>Linda M. Nepter</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>Dallas P.H.</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>Robert W. Hall</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSU #37</u> <u>Rangely</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>Vernon C. Nottall</u>	<u>11/6/08</u>	<u>MSAU #7</u> <u>Rangely</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>David W. Murphy, State Agent</u>	<u>11/8/08</u>	<u>Opton</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
<u>David W. Murphy, State Agent</u>	<u>11/8/08</u>	<u>Colebrook</u>
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
Signature/Title	Date	SAU
Signature/Title	Date	SAU

**Reorganization Plan Cover Sheet**  
(Please attach Reorganization Plan as Exhibit A)

Required Elements							
Law Reference Item Number Sub- Chapter 2	Item	N/A	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Identified Barrier <sup>1</sup>	Need Assistance <sup>2</sup>
3.A(1)	SAUs included in RSU		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(2)	Size of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Composition of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Apportionment of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(3)	Method of voting of the governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(4)	Composition of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Powers of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Duties of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(5)	Disposition of real & personal school property		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(6)	Disposition of existing school indebtedness (if not using provisions of section 1506)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disposition of lease-purchase obligations (if not using provisions of section 1506)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(7)	Assignment of school personnel contracts		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Assignment of school collective bargaining agreements		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Assignment of other school contractual obligations		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(8)	Disposition of existing school funds and existing financial obligations		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(9)	Transition plan that addresses the development of a budget for the first school year		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Transition plan that addresses interim personnel policies		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(10)	Documentation of the public meeting(s) held to prepare or review reorganization plan		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(11)	Explanation of how units that approve reorganization plan will proceed if one or more units do not approve the plan		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(12)	Estimate of cost savings to be achieved		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(13)	Such other matters as the governing bodies of the school administrative units in existence on the effective date of this chapter may determine to be necessary		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> Please explain why this is a barrier and what assistance you need to remove this barrier on the next page.

<sup>2</sup> Please explain what assistance you need to complete this portion of your plan, and state from whom you need assistance, on page 3.

Parameters for Plan Development							
Law Reference Item Number Sub-Chapter 2	Item	N/A	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Identified Barrier <sup>3</sup>	Need Assistance <sup>4</sup>
3.B(1)	Enrollment meets requirements (2,500 except where circumstances justify an exception <sup>5</sup> )		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sec. XXXX-36, Parameter B	When viewed in conjunction with surrounding proposed units, may not result in one or more municipalities being denied the option to join an RSU.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(2)	Comprehensive programming for all students grades K - 12.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Includes at least one publicly supported high school		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(3)	Consistent with policies set forth in section 1451		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(4)	No displacement of teachers		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No displacement of students		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No closures of schools existing or operating during school year immediately preceding reorganization, except as permitted under section 1512		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sec. XXXX-26, Parameter F	The plan must address how the school administrative unit will reorganize administrative functions, duties and noninstructional personnel so that the projected expenditures of the reorganized school unit in fiscal year 2008-2009 for system administration, transportation, special education and facilities and maintenance will not have an adverse impact on the instructional program <sup>6</sup>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborative Agreements							
						Yes	No
Does your plan currently include information/documentation on collaborative agreements? (not required, but encouraged)						<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Exceptions to 2,500 minimum

Actual number of students for which the SAU is fiscally responsible: 1087 (NEW RSU BASED ON 10/06 ENROLLMENT DATA)

Exception	Exception Claimed in Plan	Documentation Provided? (Please attach as Exhibit B)	
		Yes	No
Geography	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demographics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Population Density	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Unique Circumstances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Approval letter from the Commissioner

<sup>3</sup> Please explain why this is a barrier and what assistance you need to remove this barrier on the next page.

<sup>4</sup> Please explain what assistance you need to complete this portion of your plan, and state from whom you need assistance, on page 3.

<sup>5</sup> Please note in the Exceptions to 2500 minimum section on next page

<sup>6</sup> This requirement is only for those who plan to be operational as an RSU in fiscal year 2008-2009, in accordance with a Reorganization Plan that is approved by the Commissioner and by the voters.

**Explanation of Barriers –**

Please use this section to explain any/all barriers identified on the previous page as a barrier in completing your Reorganization Plan.

Law Reference/Required Element	Explanation of the barrier
	N/A

**Assistance Needs –**

Please use this section to describe your needs for assistance and from whom you need assistance.

Law Reference/Required Element	Explanation of your assistance need	Assistance needed from whom?
	N/A	

## **1. School Administrative Units in the Proposed Regional School Unit.**

The proposed regional school unit includes the following school administrative units, or such of them as approve this plan in satisfaction of the requirements in section 11 (The Plan if One or More School Administrative Units Reject the Consolidation Plan) for the formation of the Regional School Unit (hereafter know as the RSU).

- (1) Dallas Plantation
- (2) Town of Gilead
- (3) Lincoln Plantation
- (4) Magalloway Plantation
- (5) Town of Rangeley
- (6) Rangeley Plantation
- (7) Sandy River Plantation
- (8) Town of Upton
- (9) Maine School Administrative District # 44
  - Consisting of the towns of:
  - a. Andover
  - b. Bethel
  - c. Greenwood
  - d. Newry
  - e. Woodstock

## **2. The Size, Composition and Appointment of the Governing Body.**

1. The new RSU shall have a 20-member board with each town having representation on said board.
2. Board members will be paid \$25.00 for each regularly scheduled meeting and sub-committee meeting attended. Board composition may be changed by any method permitted by law.
3. At the first meeting of the RSU board, lots will be drawn to determine initial term lengths, consistent with section 1472-B and other applicable law. In those municipalities with 4 or more Board members, two will serve a one-year term, one will serve a two-year term and one will serve a three-year term. In municipalities with 2 Board members, one will serve a two-year term and one a three-year term. The board members from municipalities with one member will draw lots that will cause them to be divided proportionally into terms of one, two and three years.
4. The weights of votes for the Board members will be the population of each town (from the 2006 estimated census) divided by that town's number of members serving on the Board. The weight of votes for Board members will be adjusted based on the biennial census figures for the RSU.
5. A majority vote of the Board shall be determined by the majority of the weighted votes of those present and voting except when otherwise required by law or a specific provision contained in this plan. A school operated within the regional school unit may not be closed unless closure of the school is approved at a regular or special meeting of the regional school unit board by an affirmative vote of  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the elected membership or voting power of the regional school unit board, with the exception of any schools that are closed by an existing SAU member of the RSU prior to the operations date of the RSU.
6. A change or amendment to this plan will require a  $\frac{2}{3}^{\text{rd}}$  majority vote of the full membership of the RSU Board. This vote is required for both the first reading and second reading of any proposed change or amendment. Changes or amendments to this plan will also require the approval of the majority of the voters in the RSU voting on such changes and the approval of the Commissioner of Education.

7. The RSU Board shall have the authority to designate other issues that will require a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority vote. That vote will require a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority vote of the total membership of the full RSU Board

8. If sub-committees of the RSU Board are established, each member of the sub-committee will have one vote. Weighted voting will not be used for sub-committee purposes.

9. See Exhibit C "School Closure Policy".

### **3. The Method of Voting of the Governing Body.**

The proposed plan for this section is labeled as Option D in the plan template provided by Drummond and Woodsum. It allows weighted voting without the imposition of the 1000 total votes as has been used by some district boards in the past. Unless errors in the population or calculation exist, this method is practically certain to meet the "one man one vote" rule. It relies completely on the populations of each of the communities and can easily be adjusted in accordance with 20-A MRSA section 1475 should those populations change or if a community votes against participation in the RSU once the plan has been submitted to the voters.

#### **Composition and Apportionment of the Governing Body**

Town	Town Census	RSU Members	Votes/Member
Dallas Plantation	244	1	244
Gilead	177	1	177
Lincoln Plantation	46	1	46
Magalloway Plantation	37	1	37
Rangeley	1155	2	578
Rangeley Plantation	120	1	120
Sandy River Plantation	91	1	91
Upton	62	1	62
Andover	907	2	454
Bethel	2642	4	661
Greenwood	793	2	397
Newry	379	1	379
Woodstock	1384	2	692
Totals	8037	20	
Majority			4022

#### **4. Composition, Powers and Duties of Local School Committees.**

A. Formation. Effective 3 years after the initial starting date of the RSU, any member town's municipal officers may petition the RSU board for a local school committee. Petitions will be approved by the RSU board unless the petition is rejected for one or more specific reasons, which will be provided in writing to the municipal officers. If the petition is rejected, the municipal officers may schedule a municipal referendum within 12 months from the date of the rejection on the question whether a local school committee shall be formed. If the voters in the municipality seeking a local school committee vote in this referendum in favor of formation of local school committee, the local school committee shall be formed and shall have the functions approved by the voters. Petitions from an individual town may only be submitted once in each 12-month period.

A petition or warrant article to create a local school committee must identify which of the local school committee functions are requested from among those allowed by law and provided for by RSU policy.

Members of a new local school committee created under this section shall be elected under the provisions of the statutes governing election of municipal school committees.

B. Elimination. A local school committee may be terminated using the process parallel to that in section A.

C. Effective Date. The effective date of either the creation or elimination of a local school committee shall be the first day of the fiscal year following the action.

## **5. The Disposition of Real and Personal Property.**

A. Real Property and Fixtures: Except as listed below, all real property interests, including without limitation land, buildings, other improvements to realty, easements, option rights, first refusal rights and purchase rights, and all fixtures of the School Administrative Units shall become property of the RSU. The RSU Board may require such deeds, assignments or other instruments of transfer as in its judgment is necessary to establish the RSU's right, title and interest in such real property and fixtures.

The following real property interests and associated fixtures shall not be transferred:

None

All real property and fixtures not described above shall be transferred to the RSU.

B. Personal Property: All other tangible school personal property, including moveable equipment, furnishings, textbooks and all other curriculum materials, supplies and inventories shall become property of the RSU as successor of the SAUs, except as listed below:

None

The RSU Board may require such assignments, bills of sale or other instruments of transfer as in its judgment is necessary to establish the RSU's right, title and interest in such personal property.

With regard to disposal or other use of real property, the RSU board will follow the guidelines listed in 20-A M.R.S.A. § 4103 "Disposal or other use of real property closed for school purposes"

## **6. Disposition of Existing School Indebtedness and Lease Purchase Obligations.**

A. Bonds, Notes and Lease Purchase Agreements That the RSU will Assume: The RSU shall assume liability to pay the following bonds, notes and lease purchase agreements:

Name of SAU	Year Issued	Original Principle	Asset assignment	Principle Bal. 6/30/09	Maturity Date
Rangeley					
	2005	\$38,174.73	Copiers	\$7,594.73	8/1/09
	2007	\$11,500.00	Supts. Copiers	\$6,900.00	7/2/11
	2008	\$21,540.00	Copier	\$16,155.00	3/31/13
SAD # 44					
	2007	\$70,011	Bus	\$41,937	7/15/11
	2007	\$70,011	Bus	\$41,938	7/15/11
	2008	\$80,403	Bus	\$62,932	10/12/12
	2008	\$47,561	Bus	\$38,048	11/30/12

Additionally, other bonds, notes or lease purchase agreements issued by a member SAU before the operational date of the region shall not be assumed by the RSU, unless that the SAU issued the bond, note or lease purchase agreement in the normal course of its management of the schools for an essential purpose for replacement of existing items of equipment that are no longer serviceable or to keep them in normal operation condition.

B. Bonds, Notes and Lease Purchase Agreements That the Region Will Not Assume.

Pursuant to 20-M.R.S.A. § 1506(4), the RSU does not assume the following bonds, notes and lease purchase agreements, which shall continue to be paid by the original members of the SAU indicated, and the RSU shall serve as fiscal agent for the SAU for that purpose.

Name of SAU	Year Issued	Original Principle	Asset assignment	Principle Bal. 6/30/09	Maturity Date
Rangeley	2004	\$180,430.78	Café/Music/Art	\$35,387.89	12/8/09
	2006	\$312,758.39	Roof	\$114,080.39	9/1/09

	2007	\$137,907.60	Technology	\$45,969.20	8/2/09
	2008	\$153,707.40	Computers	\$103,977.90	8/3/11
Sad 44	1993	\$4,845,000	C.P. addition	\$1,211,250	11/1/13
	2003	\$752,593	T. water/sewer	\$501,730	11/1/18
	2004	\$986,400	T. Track/ aud.	\$789,120	11/1/24
	2007	\$499,680	Reg. 9	\$275,973	11/15/17
	2008	\$914,052	Reg. 9	\$853,115	8/15/22

The debt assigned to the Town of Rangeley as noted above shall be shared by all six (6) municipalities making up former Maine School Union#37 using the formula employed to determine the cost sharing of MSU#37's Office of the Superintendent. That formula based on data (Valuation and Number of students) for school year 2009-2010 is as follows:

- > Dallas Plantation 14.88%
- > Lincoln Plantation 1.48%
- > Magalloway Plantation 1.70%
- > Town of Rangeley 60.00%
- > Rangeley Plantation 14.72%
- > Sandy River Plantation 7.22%

C. New Capital Project Debt That the RSU Will Issue and Assume:

At this time there are no school construction or minor capital projects known that will require authorization of the legislative body of the SAU to issue bonds or other approval of debt.

D. Defaulted Debt: Notwithstanding anything in this Plan to the contrary, except where legally required to do so, the RSU will not assume any bond, note, or lease purchase agreement as to which the SAU is in breach or has defaulted.

## **7. Assignment of School Personnel Contracts, School Collective Bargaining Agreements and Other School Contractual Obligations.**

- A. School Personnel Contracts: A list of the written individual employment contracts to which each of the existing SAUs is a party is shown below. Pursuant to section XXXX-43(5), individuals on the list who are employed on the day before the operational date shall become employed by the RSU as of the operational date, and their contracts shall be assumed by the RSU on the operational date. This provision does not prevent the existing SAU's from terminating or nonrenewing the contracts of employees in accordance with applicable law before the operational date of the RSU. The list shall be updated and made final no later than the day before the operational date of the RSU.

Name	Position	Expiration Date
David Murphy	Superintendent	6/30/13
Cindy Moxcey	Accountant	6/30/10
Robin Gundersen	Adm. Assistant H.R.	6/30/10
Elise Thomas	Special Ed. Dir.	6/30/09
Tammy House	Spec. Ed. Sec.	6/30/09
Jean Waite	Adult Ed. Dir.	6/30/11
Ronald Deegan	Trans. Director	6/30/09
Burnham Rice	B and G Dir.	6/30/10
Peter Kuzyk	Comp. Coord.	6/30/09
Ray Geiger	Technology Tech 210 days	6/30/09
Karen Rosenberg	C.N.A. Health aide	6/30/10
Sandra Schroeder	TMS Principal	6/30/10

Daniel Hart	THS Principal	6/30/11
Charles Raymond	THS Dean	6/30/10
Gail Wight	Tel Ath. Dir.	6/30/10
Philip Richardson	Superintendent	6/30/11
Sharon Connally	Principal	6/30/10
Thomas Philbrick	Ath. Dir. And Student Success	6/30/09
Sheila Raymond	Adm. Assistant Superintendent	6/30/10
Monica Gordan	Dir. Transp.	6/30/09
Lynn Richards	Technology Int. Specialist	6/30/09

Currently there are 0 employees in the Central Office of School Union # 37 that do not have written individual employment contracts and 0 employees in M.S.A.D. #44 that do not have written individual employment contracts. Pursuant to Section XXXX-43(5), individuals who are employed on the day before the operational date of the RSU shall become employed by the RSU as of the operational date of the RSU. This provision does not prevent the existing SAU's from terminating employment of the employees in accordance with applicable law before the operational date of the RSU. A list of these employees will be made final no later than the day before the operational date of the RSU.

The duties and assignments of all employees transferred to the RSU shall be determined by the Superintendent of the RSU or his/her designee.

**B. School Collective Bargaining Agreements:** The following collective bargaining agreements to which the SAUs are a party to shall be assumed by the RSU Board as of the operational date:

SAU	Positions Included in Unit	Next Termination Date
M.S.A.D. # 44	Teachers, Nurses, Ed. Techs, secretaries	8/31/10

M.S.A.D. # 44	Bus Drivers, custodians, cafeteria workers, maintenance	6/30/09
Members of School Union 37	Teachers	8/31/10
Members of School Union 37	Ed. Techs, Cafeteria workers, Custodians (inc. supervisory), secretary, bus drivers, library associates	8/31/11

All of the employer's rights and responsibilities with respect to collective bargaining shall be fully assumed by the RSU Board as of the operational date of the RSU.

C. Other School Contractual Obligations: A list of all contracts to which the existing SAU's are a party and that will be in effect as of the operational date of the RSU are listed below. The RSU shall assume the following contracts as of the operational date of the RSU.

SAU	Contracting Party	Type of Contract	Expiration Date
Rangeley	Sandy River Plt.	Student Transportation	6/30/10
M.S.A.D. # 44	Honeywell	Mechanical Maintenance	8/31/09
Members of SAU 37	Maine State Billing	Medicaid Adm.	10/12/09
Members of SAU 37	Common Remitter Services	403(b) Compliance	9/25/11

The individual SAU Boards and superintendents will attempt to terminate or negotiate for termination of the following contracts prior to the operational date of the RSU.



## **8. Disposition of Existing School Funds and Financial Obligations.**

A. Existing Financial Obligations: Pursuant to Section XXXX-36(5) of Title 20-A M.R.S.A., the disposition of existing financial obligations is governed by this plan.

Existing financial obligations shall include the following:

- i. All accounts payable
- ii. To the extent not included in accounts payable, any financial obligations which under generally accepted accounting principles would be considered expenses of the existing SAUs included within this plan for any year prior to the year the RSU becomes operational, whether or not such expenses were budgeted by the SAU in the year the obligations were incurred, excluding summer salaries and benefits owed to employees for work performed during the 2008-09 school year, including salary and compensation payable after June 30, 2009.
- iii. All other liabilities arising under the generally accepted accounting principles that can be reasonably estimated and are probable.

Each SAU shall satisfy its existing financial obligations from all legally available funds. If an SAU has not satisfied all of its existing financial obligations, the SAU shall transfer sufficient funds to the RSU to satisfy its remaining existing financial obligations, and the RSU Board shall be authorized to satisfy those existing financial obligations on behalf of the SAU. If the SAU does not transfer to the RSU sufficient funds to satisfy its existing financial obligations, then to the extent permitted by law, the RSU Board may satisfy those obligations from balances that the SAU transfers to the RSU. If the available balances transferred are insufficient to satisfy the SAU's existing financial obligations, or are not legally available for that purpose, the RSU Board may take any action permitted by law so that all of the municipalities of the region are treated equitably with respect to the unsatisfied existing financial obligations of an SAU. For example, to the extent permitted by law, the RSU Board may satisfy the unpaid existing financial obligations of an SAU in the same manner and with the same authority as for unassumed debt under the provisions of 20-A M.R.S.A. §1506(4).

Additionally, to the extent permitted by law, if in the judgment of the RSU Board it must raise funds from all its members to satisfy existing financial obligations of an SAU, the RSU Board also shall be authorized to raise additional amounts for the purpose of making equitable distribution (which may be made in the form of credit against assessed local shares of the RSU's approved budget) to those RSU members that would otherwise bear costs attributable to unsatisfied existing financial obligations of an SAU for which they had no financial responsibility. The intent of the preceding sentence is that financial responsibility for unsatisfied existing financial obligations of an SAU be borne by its members and not by the other members of the RSU.

- B. Remaining Balances: The balance remaining in the existing SAU's school accounts after the SAU has satisfied existing financial obligations in accordance with this plan shall be paid to the treasurer of the RSU, verified by audit and used to reduce that SAU's contribution as provided by Section XXXX-43(4). In the event that an existing SAU transfers a large balance which may or may not include accrued summer salary funds, the SAU School Board shall justify in writing to the RSU Board the number of years over which the balance will be used to affect the SAU's contribution to the expenses of the RSU. In the absence of such written direction from the SAU, the RSU Board shall have the authority to determine the number of years over which the unallocated balance will be used. Unless the Legislature otherwise provides, in the case of M.S.A.D. # 44, the school board of the district shall specify in writing to the RSU Board how the RSU shall allocate transferred balances between the members of the district. Unless the Legislature otherwise provides, if the MSAD # 44 Board has not specified in writing to the RSU Board how the transferred balances are to be allocated, then the transferred balances shall be credited to the District's members in proportion to their respective shares of that portion of the total local costs of the region allocable to all of the District's members for the operational year.

Transfers of remaining balances of MSAD # 44 shall occur before the District has closed its accounts and ceased normal operations. Transfer of the remaining balances of the municipal units making up the RSU may occur within the period specified by Section XXXX 43(4).

- C. Reserve Funds: Existing SAU's shall transfer remaining balances of reserve funds to the RSU. Unless otherwise provided by applicable law, a transferred reserve fund shall be used in accordance with its original purpose to benefit a school or schools of the SAU. Transferred reserve

funds shall be subject to Title 20- A M.R.S.A. §1491, except that the transfer of funds in a reserve fund or a change in purpose of the fund may only occur in such manner that the funds continue to benefit the members of the SAU that transferred that reserve fund to the RSU. Notwithstanding the foregoing, reserve funds for summer salaries and benefits, if any, transferred by an SAU to the RSU shall be treated as "remaining balances" under section 8-B and used to reduce that SAU's contribution as provided by Section XXXX-43(4).

An exception to the transfer of Reserve Funds shall be the Town of Gilead Educational Reserve Fund. This fund shall remain in the control of the municipal officers of the Town of Gilead and shall be used at their direction for exclusively for the purposes of reducing the towns tax assessment for their share of education services within the RSU.

- D. Scholarship Funds: SAUs shall transfer remaining balances of scholarship funds to the RSU. Scholarships shall be limited to the original pool of potential recipients unless otherwise provided by the donor or applicable law.
- E. Trust Funds: The existing SAUs that become members of the RSU shall transfer trust funds to the RSU. The RSU Board shall be deemed the successor trustee for all purposes, except as provided by the trust or by applicable law.
- F. Ownership of Funds and Accounts: All of the school accounts and funds of the existing SAU shall become the property of the RSU on the operational date, and the treasurer of the RSU shall have the authority of those accounts.

**9. Transition Plan that Addresses the Development of  
a Budget for the First School Year of the Reorganized Unit  
and Interim Personnel Policies.**

- A. Transitional Authority: The initial RSU Board shall be elected as soon as possible following approval of the RSU consolidation plan in accordance with 20-A M.R.S.A. § 1472-A and shall have the transitional powers and duties provided by 20 – M.R.S.A. § 1461-A. Any costs incurred by the RSU Board during the transition period shall be shared among the member units in accordance with the cost sharing plan described in section 13-B of this plan.
- B. Transition Plan for Personnel Policies: All personnel policies existing in the existing SAUs shall continue to apply to the same employment positions after they become part of the RSU and until such time as the RSU Board develops and adopts RSU-wide policies. After the operational date of the RSU, the RSU Board and superintendent will develop and adopt region-wide policies in accordance with applicable law.
- C. Prior to the election of the RSU Board, the current SAU Board will, working with their superintendents, begin preparation of a recommended budget for each school site and the proposed central administrative office. Upon election of the RSU Board, the recommended budgets will be provided to the RSU Board. The RSU Board will then assume responsibility for final preparation and presentation of the budget for the first operational year of the RSU. Specific duties regarding preparation of the budget for the first operational year of the RSU may be assigned to existing personnel with the approval of the employing SAU. The RSU Board shall complete development of the budget and present the recommended budget for consideration by the residents of the RSU in compliance with statutes governing the consideration and approval of the RSU budget.

**10. Documentation of the Public Meeting or Public Meetings Held to Prepare or Review the Reorganization Plan.**

Minutes of the following public meeting(s) held to prepare or review the reorganization plan are attached as Exhibit D:

Date of Public Meeting	Time	Location
September 25, 2008 (subcommittee)	Noon	Brian's Bistro, Rumford
October 9, 2008	6:00 PM	Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico
October 16, 2008	6:00 PM	Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico
October 23, 2008	6:00 PM	Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico
October 30, 2008	6:00 PM	Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico
November 6, 2008	6:00 PM	Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico

See Exhibit D

## **11. Procedure if One or More SAU's Reject the Consolidation Plan.**

If one or more of the existing SAUs that are a party to this plan fail to approve the plan, the SAUs that approve the plan shall proceed as follows;

1. If one or more of the member SAUs fail to approve this plan, but the remaining SAUs that have approved the plan had 1,000 or more students as of October 1, 2006, the RSU shall be formed by those SAUs approving the plan, if permitted by applicable law. In this case, the members of the RPC representing the approving SAUs shall reconvene and make any necessary changes to the plan that are required due to the absence of the SAU(s) that failed to approve the plan. The RPC shall have full authority to make the required changes in the plan and to submit the revisions to the Commissioner of Education for approval, provided that each of the existing SAU School Boards of the participating SAUs approve submission of the revisions to the Commissioner. Once the Commissioner has approved the plan, the member SAU Boards will proceed with the duties required of them to cause the election of the RSU Board and any other duties that are required within this plan or applicable law.
2. If one or more of the member SAUs fail to approve this plan and the remaining SAUs that approved the plan had less than 1,000 students as of October 1, 2006, a reconstituted RPC will reconvene and will consider opportunities to join with the same or other SAUs to complete a new reorganization plan pursuant to Section XXXX-36(11). In doing so, the RPC may seek the assistance of the Department of Education in development of a new plan and/or identification of new potential partners.
3. Should one or more SAUs fail to approve this plan and the reconstituted RPC fail to develop a new reorganization plan and an RSU is not formed, each individual SAU shall be independent in its operation and may seek whatever opportunities that are available and lawful for compliance with the reorganization statutes.

## **12. An estimate of the cost savings to be achieved by the formation of the RSU.**

The consolidation of the Central Office staff may result in a cost increase from the current expenditure in the amount of \$7,500.00

The consolidation of the School Boards may result in a cost savings of approximately \$10,750 in the areas of rental space, dues and fees, liability insurance and bonding of employees, supplies and a board contingency budget.

The consolidation of transportation services, special education administration and facilities and maintenance may result in a cost savings of \$56,000 as a result of reducing 1.5 FTE positions.

For the above operations, the approximate net savings that may be achieved amount to \$59,000.

In addition to the savings noted, the cost avoidance of the penalty for non-compliance in the first year is \$299,349 which yields a total cost avoidance/savings estimate for the RSU of \$358,349

As part of the formation of the RSU, there are likely to be leveling up costs for incorporating the various employee groups into a single collective bargaining agreement. Currently, there are discrepancies in the pay scales for teachers and support staff as well as differences in the health insurance benefits for each classification of employees.

Those "leveling up" costs will need to be addressed during the first three years of operation for the RSU.

For the teaching staff, an estimated leveling up cost for salaries within the two SAUs is approximately \$94,000. The benefits leveling up cost for the teachers is approximately \$68,000, which is based on bringing members of SU 37 staff to the current benefit level for the SAD 44 staff except for the full family plan subscribers in SAD 44 (17) where the members of SU 37 benefit is likely to be the target amount.

For the support staff, the approximate "leveling up" cost is estimated to be \$63,000 in wages. The differences in cost for the health insurance benefits for

the support staff is not as consequential and is not likely to be a significant issue.

The net savings for the SAUs forming this RSU is estimated to be \$59,000 per year in years 1 and 2. The cost avoidance achieved by avoiding the penalty situation will continue annually as will the net savings achieved by the reduction of 1.5 positions in the transportation and facilities and maintenance operation.

There may be additional cost savings achieved through efficiencies that develop and/or the sharing of additional staff and cooperative agreements with other SAUs or RSUs in the region. It is not possible to quantify those potential savings at this time.

See Exhibit E

### **13-A. Plans to Reorganize Administration, Transportation, Building and Maintenance and Special Education.**

With the formation of the RSU, the Central Administrative Operation will be consolidated with one school board replacing nine boards, and the superintendent's office being consolidated into one site with one set of employees.

The superintendent's office may be staffed as follows:

Position:

Superintendent

Business Manager

Accountant

Payroll/HR Manager

Secretary/Receptionist

The Board of Directors will be reduced to one Board for the RSU. The plan calls for a board that consists of 20 members representing the communities within the RSU. With the number of students and the allocation for Central Administration Services, the RSU will likely still exceed the EPS allocation at \$204/student for these functions.

The special education program may be supervised by one Special Education Director with support from a secretary.

Curriculum development may be supervised by a Curriculum Coordinator.

The supervision of transportation may be provided by a single transportation director, resulting in a reduction of one part-time position.

The facilities and maintenance operation may be supervised by a single building and grounds supervisor, resulting in the reduction of one hourly wage position.

As a result of these plans, the superintendent's office may retain staff numbers that equal the current number of employees. However, the job placements may be altered from the present configuration to improve function and efficiency.

As a result of the reorganization in special education, facilities and maintenance and transportation there may be a net reduction of 1.5 positions.

This reorganization will not have an adverse impact on the instructional program.

### **13- B. Cost Sharing In the Regional School Unit.**

Cost Sharing for Additional Local Funds: For the first three operational years of the RSU (FY 2010-2012) each member SAU shall be responsible for its share of additional local funds in an amount based upon the proportional share of the additional local funds raised in FY 2009. For those SAUs which did not raise any additional local funds in FY 2009, they will not be responsible for raising any portion of the RSU additional local funds in these first three years. In the case of M.S.A.D. # 44, the amount required of the District shall be shared within the current members of the District in accordance with the cost sharing plan which currently exists within the District, which is based solely on valuation of the member communities.

Proportional Shares for the first three years shall be as follows:

<u>SAU</u>	<u>Current Share</u>	<u>Percentage Share</u>
Dallas Plantation	\$296,568	12.68%
Gilead	\$ 0	0.00%
Lincoln Plantation	\$0	0.00%
Magalloway Plantation	\$32,009	1.37%
Rangeley	\$529,439	22.64%
Rangeley Plantation	\$160,967	6.88%
Sandy River Plantation	\$123,602	5.29%
Upton	\$0.00	0.00%
MSAD # 44	\$1,195,769	51.14%
Total (current Yr.)	\$2,338,354	100.00%

Beginning in operational year four and thereafter, the cost sharing formula may be altered pursuant to the process outlined below in the section of the plan entitled "Process to Change the Cost Sharing Plan".

Should the RSU Board determine that the cost sharing formula needs to be changed to maintain an appropriate level of fairness and equity among the member SAUs, such plan changes may include, but not be limited to consideration of sharing costs based upon valuation, pupil counts, population or any other factor(s) that may be considered. However, in any formula devised by the RSU Board, the method of sharing costs within the current members of SAD # 44 shall remain as outlined above in the first paragraph of this plan section.

Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the method by which they allocate amongst themselves their aggregate share of such costs shall be amended if approved at a referendum vote called by the RSU board in the member towns of the RSU that belonged to M.S.A.D. #44, and approved by a majority of the voters in each of those towns.

Notwithstanding any of the above, the RSU Board shall be required to study the cost sharing plan in the first three years of operation of the RSU and may as a result of that study propose a change in the cost sharing plan in accordance with the provisions below that provide for a change in the cost sharing plan.

### Changing the Cost Sharing Plan

Any changes proposed to the cost sharing plan outlined in plan section 13-B shall be done in accordance with the following process:

1. The RSU Board of Directors shall be required to study the cost sharing formula and its effects upon the member communities within the first three years of operation and at a minimum of once every five years thereafter.
2. If as a result of such study, the RSU Board determines to make a change in the cost sharing formula, the changes and their impacts on each of the member communities shall be presented in a public hearing to such members of the public who wish to attend the hearing and comment on the proposed change
3. If following the public hearing and any further study that may arise, the RSU Board determines to make a change in the cost sharing formula, such change may only be made if approved by a 2/3rds. majority of the weighted vote of the entire membership of the RSU Board.
4. Once a change is implemented in the cost sharing formula, the newly revised formula must be used for a minimum of three years.

## **Section 13-C. Election of Initial Board of Directors.**

See Section 2

### **Section 13-D. Tuition Contracts and School Choice.**

Existing tuition contracts in place at the current time include agreements between M.S.A.D. #44 and the towns of Gilead and Upton. These agreements will become unnecessary if Gilead, Upton and M.S.A.D. #44 become part of the RSU, and Gilead and Upton students will attend RSU schools. All municipalities of MSU #37 (with the exception of Rangeley) currently attend the Rangeley school on a tuition basis. Students in municipalities now in MSU #37 that join the RSU shall attend RSU schools. Unorganized territory students also attend school in both M.S.A.D. #44 and members of MSU #37 on a tuition basis.

Students who now have school choice will continue to have school choice.

### **Section 13-E: Claims and Insurance.**

There are no known legal claims against the municipalities of MSU # 37 or M.S.A.D. # 44 at this time. There is one suit filed on behalf of the municipalities of MSU # 37 against their insurance company alleging failure to pay costs due for defense of a completed special education case that was decided by the courts. All costs and benefits resulting from this lawsuit will remain with the municipalities of MSU #37.

There are no known insurance claims pending against the municipalities of MSU # 37 or M.S.A.D. # 44 at this time.

**Section 13-F: Vote to Submit reorganization plan to  
Commisioner.**

None

### **Section 13-G: RSU with fewer than 2,500 students.**

Given the Geography of the region and the alignment of other RSU partners, members of MSU # 37 and M.S.A.D. # 44 are the only two systems remaining in this Western Region of the State. There are no additional partners to affiliate with and the area qualifies as a rural and remote part of the State. Therefore, the Commissioner of Education has approved the formation of this RSU with less than 1,200 students.

Once formed, the RSU may explore avenues of collaboration with its neighboring school systems or RSUs in order to achieve cost savings and efficiencies.

### **Section 13-H. CTE Regions.**

The formation of this RSU will result in students being eligible to attend two different CTE Regions for their career and technical programs. It is the intent of the RSU that students from the current communities included in members of MSU #37 will continue to attend the Foster CTE Regional Center in Farmington and that students from the current communities included in M.S.A.D. # 44 will continue to attend the Region 9 CTE Regional Center. Should individual students within the RSU desire to alter their attendance area for this purpose, the RSU Board will utilize the existing procedures in state statute and rules to accomplish the necessary change in attendance area for CTE programs.

The RSU Board shall be the successor to the current SAU Boards for the purpose of implementing the current or new CTE cooperative agreement. Costs of a CTE regional budget shall be the allocated within the RSU pursuant to the agreed upon cost sharing method. No amendment to the Cooperative Agreement shall be binding without the final approval of the RSU Board. Nothing contained in this plan shall confer rights on any creditors or bondholders of a CTE region or to extend liability for CTE region debts, liabilities or obligations to the RSU members that are no members of the CTE region.

Should changes in the CTE budget process for either the Farmington or Region 9 regional centers need to occur due to this consolidation or other factors outside of this plan, the RSU Board during its interim period or after the date of operation shall have the sole authority to represent the RSU and its member communities in approving and implementing such changes.

Consideration of a budget of a CTE region that uses the "school administrative unit method" of budget approval provided by sections 8460 (2) (A) (1) and 8461 of Title 20-A shall occur at the RSU budget meeting. The moderator shall instruct the voters on a voting method that includes only the CTE region members.

For purposes of this section, CTE region members are deemed to include municipalities that belong to M.S.A.D. # 44 and the individual municipalities of MSU # 37.



JOHN ELIAS BALDACC  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
23 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE  
04333-0023

EXHIBIT B

SUSAN A. GENDRON  
COMMISSIONER

October 20, 2008

David Murphy, Superintendent  
Upton School Department  
21 Philbrook Street  
Bethel, ME 04217

Dear Superintendent Murphy,

Thank you for the revised Notice of Intent received October 20, 2008, which requests approval for the Upton School Department to proceed with work on a Reorganization Plan with MSAD 44, and the Gilead, Dallas Plantation, Lincoln Plantation, Magalloway Plantation, Rangeley Plantation, Sandy River Plantation, and Rangeley School Departments.

I have reviewed the intended actions as described in your amended Notice of Intent and have determined that they do comply with the requirements of the Reorganization Law.

I wish you success as you continue your work. If my office can be of assistance as you proceed, please contact Norm Higgins or Ray Poulin of the Reorganization Team, they can be reached by phone at 624-6802.

Sincerely,

Susan A. Gendron  
Commissioner of Education

## **"EXHIBIT C"**

### **SCHOOL CLOSURE POLICY**

The RSU Planning Committee recognizes the sensitive nature of school closure. This policy is to insure that any school closure proposal occurs in a reasonable and deliberate manner. The following policy prescribes the procedure for any school closure process before the matter can come before the entire RSU school board for a vote. A school closure process should entail a lengthy and complete look at both the past and future. This process shall take no less than two years. Completion of the process shall provide information to both the School Board and the communities within the RSU district. A document shall be prepared by the Board, which provides all of the following information before a vote at the Board level is undertaken. A summary of this document (including the information in #1, #9 & #10 described below) shall be published in a public news medium that is distributed no less than weekly in each of the member towns. This summary shall include instructions for residents of member municipalities to obtain a copy of the full report at no cost. The full document shall be available on the RSU website no less than three business days after the official presentation to the RSU Board.

The process must include:

1. A financial description of all operational costs of the school in question for the previous five years as well as for projected costs for the next five years. This shall be compared to the same information for all other schools within the RSU district.
2. A financial description of all operational costs of closing the school in question.
3. An analysis of all of the RSU school's population for recent past as well as projected into the next five years.
4. An investigation of other ideas for the use of the building or expansion of programs to assist the school in question survival and operation.
5. A review of all economic indicators that might affect the school's viability. (subdivision applications, home sales, business openings/closings, etc.)

6. Descriptions of all successful and unsuccessful efforts to create/expand/develop programs that would make the school more viable.

7. A description of past capital investments (repairs) in all schools in the district as well as a thorough description of future investments (other than general repairs) necessary to keep all schools open and efficient.

8. A plan for provision of services of all students if a school were to close. (Provision of transportation, school choice, personnel issues, to name just a few.)

9. A description of the financial implications to taxpayers in each of the towns with and without the school closure.

10. Community descriptors

11. Dates and times of two (2) public hearings to be held after media publication of the summary and prior to the RSU 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority vote. One of these hearings must be held in the municipality that is home to the affected school. These public hearings may be incorporated in a regularly scheduled RSU meeting provided that meeting meets all required notice of agenda and meeting date.

Any changes in this policy MUST be reviewed and approved by a 2/3 vote of the full membership of the RSU Board. No changes to this policy may be enacted during the first cycle of the RSUs elected representatives. Changes may be proposed after the seating of second cycle of elected representatives.

The first cycle is defined as the election of the initial RSU Board. The second cycle is defined as beginning with the Board election following the expiration of the first set of three year terms for those Board members who were originally elected to a three year term of office.

**"EXHIBIT D"**

**School Consolidation Meeting – Subcommittees of MSAD  
44, SAU 37, Upton and Gilead  
Thursday, September 25, 2008 - Noon  
Brian's Bistro, Rumford, ME**

Present: Keith Farrington, MSAD 44; Paul Ferguson-Packard, Sandy River Plantation; Linda Dexter, Dallas Plantation; Virginia Nuthall, Rangeley; Sid Pew, MSAD 44; Rob Welch, Rangeley; Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent; Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent

1. Overview and Introductions – Representatives of the subcommittees took a few minutes to introduce themselves to the group.
2. Purpose of this Meeting – The purpose of this meeting was to determine the logistics for future meetings and come to some basic agreements about the format of those meetings. It was agreed that future meetings of the combined Regional Planning Committees would take place in Rumford. The first meeting will be a dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday October 2 at 6:00 PM. The location will be determined based on the number of people confirming that they will attend but will tentatively planned for Brian's Bistro in Rumford.
3. Timeline and Logistics - Copies of the required timelines were distributed and reviewed. For a January referendum (the latest referendum allowed by law), all plans must be submitted to the Commissioner by November 15. There may be the possibility of a short extension of a week or so if the plan is close to being finalized at that time.
4. Choosing a Facilitator – The group decided that the use of a facilitator would be required. After a short discussion of the characteristics that would be preferred in a facilitator (guide the process but do not steer the group to a preconceived goal set by the DOE), it was decided that the Superintendents would decide on a person and attempt to make arrangements to have that person begin on October 2 or as close to that date as possible.
5. Consideration of Technical Assistance with drafting the 13 sections of the Plan for RPC consideration – The group agreed that Jake Clockedile would be employed to develop drafts of the 13 areas to be considered. The cost for his services will be split between the districts. The goal of this approach would be to have at least two sections prepared for each meeting. These sections would

serve as a starting point for the week's discussion. Ideally, the information would be presented one week and voted on the next week (although there may be sections that can be approved in a single week or occasions where additional time might be deemed to be necessary for further discussion). There may also be specific sections that the group feels would be best served to be considered by a subcommittee of the combined RPC.

6. RSU VS AOS - a brief discussion – Due to the condensed timeframe of this effort and the need to develop inter local agreements for the formation of an ~~Alternative Organizational Structure (AOS)~~, it was decided that the focus should be on the development of a Regional School Unit (RSU). Some members of the group stated that this plan should try to maximize the issue of local control. Although the formation of local school committees has proven to be problematic for many RSU's and are not being recommended as a preferred course by the attorneys or by many of the people who have already engaged in these conversations, there may be ways to "build" aspects of local control into the plan itself. This will be a topic for further discussion at an upcoming RPC meeting.

7. Dates of Future meetings – It was decided that weekly meetings will be necessary between now and November 13. All meetings will be held on Thursday evenings and will begin at 6:00. The meetings will be held in Rumford at a place to be determined. It was stated that RPC members should make every effort to attend every meeting and that topics would not be revisited once the information had been discussed and considered at a specific meeting. People not able to attend should make every effort to touch base with other members of the RPC to become familiar with important information. Minutes will also be distributed for each meeting. There are 13 sections of an RSU plan that will need to come together in a very short time span.

Next meeting – Thursday, October 2, 2008 at 6:00 PM (tentatively scheduled as a dinner meeting at Brian's Bistro in Rumford but the location may change based on the numbers of people in attendance).

## **School Consolidation Minutes - October 9, 2008**

### **Chicken Coop Restaurant, Mexico**

RPC members in attendance: Ginny Nuttall, Paul Ferguson-Packard, Harold Schaetzle, Carmen Glidden, Bruce Bean, Linda Dexter, Rob Welch, Virgil Conkright, Ann Holt, Keith Farrington, Marcel Polak, Sid Pew, Mary-Ellen Gartner, Lynn Arizzi, Roberta Taylor, Ron Deegan, Bonnie Largess, Jim Largess

Others in attendance, Bill Cumming, Facilitator, Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent, Eileen Adams, Lewiston Sun, Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent

The meeting began at 6:00 PM. Bill Cumming introduced himself and reviewed hopes and expectations for the evening. He stated that although he was a facilitator paid by the DOE, he was not an employee of the DOE. Following a brief overview of his background, Mr. Cumming suggested ground rules for the meetings. These ground rules focused on the group moving forward together with "dignity, grace and loving kindness". It was agreed by all present that this would be the goal in the coming weeks.

It was agreed that future meetings would take place at a school in MSAD 43. This had been discussed in an earlier conversation between Dave Murphy and Jim Hodgkin, MSAD 43 Superintendent. An exact location will be determined and will be emailed to folks once it is established. Future meetings will last no more than 2 hours and will begin promptly at 6:00 PM. Food will be made available at 5:30 for those folks who will need to come directly to these meetings.

The group selected Sid Pew and Ginny Nuttall as co-chairs. Dave Murphy volunteered to be the secretary for the group.

Following a detailed conversation about the differences between an RSU (Regional School Unit) and an AOS (Alternative Organizational Structure), the group voted 18-0 (Pew motion, Holt second) to pursue an RSU in the coming weeks. School Boards will need to include this in their votes to submit Letter of Intent to the DOE. The Letters of Intent should be submitted as early as soon as possible. It appeared that all Boards would be considering these votes at meetings next week.

Mr. Cumming then distributed informational packets that included details on some of the initial sections of the consolidation template. Conversation took place regarding the importance of considering any special situations that might exist when building the RSU plan. Other topics of discussion included items that would be considered at a later date including the number and location of RSU meetings and whether the establishment of local school committees should be considered. One suggestion was to consider the establishment of principal advisory committees as one means of maintaining connections to the local schools. Efforts will be made to seek clarification on what rules and responsibilities can be delegated by an RSU Board to a local school committee.

Following a brief discussion, the group voted 18-0 (Pew motion, Polak second) to approve section 1 of the template. This section lists the towns that will be included in the RSU plan.

Although some initial conversation took place with regard to section 2, Mr. Cumming suggested that no vote be taken on the composition of the RSU Governance Board until the next meeting. In the meantime, members were encouraged to review the information on the composition suggestion made by Jake Clockedile and the page of explanations and suggestions that accompanied it.

Topics for consideration at the next meeting on October 16 will include the following:

- ~ Composition of the Governing Body
- ~ Whether Local School Committees (or some other structure) should be considered
- ~ Disposition of real and personal property
- ~ Disposition of local indebtedness
- ~ Disposition of Lease Purchase Agreements
- ~ Review of contracts
- ~ Disposition of existing scholarship accounts, restricted funds, etc.

Much of the above information will need to be collected and/or tabulated by the Superintendents.

Mr. Polak suggested that the members of the group also consider ways that consolidation might benefit the students of the new RSU. Mr. Cumming urged the group to consider what might be gained as a result of this consolidation process.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

The next meeting will take place on Thursday, October 16 at 6:00 PM at a location to be determined in MSAD 43.

Respectfully Submitted.

David W. Murphy, Ed.D.

## **School Consolidation Minutes – 10/16/08**

### **Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico**

RPC members in attendance: Ginny Nuttall, Paul Ferguson-Packard, Harold Schaetzle, Carmen Glidden, Bruce Bean, Linda Dexter, Rob Welch, Virgil Conkright, Ann Holt, Keith Farrington, Marcel Polak, Sid Pew, Lynn Arizzi, Roberta Taylor, Ron Deegan, Bonnie Largess, Jim Largess, Dennis Doyon, Fred Henderson, Dick Melville, Beth Smith

Others in attendance, Bill Cumming, Facilitator, Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent, Eileen Adams, Lewiston Sun, Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent

The meeting began at 6:00 P.M.

The first item of business was consideration of the minutes of the October 9 meeting. Copies were circulated (the minutes had been emailed earlier to all members). A motion was made by Rob Welch and seconded by Keith Farrington to accept the minutes as printed. The vote was unanimous (21-0). Since there were several new faces at the table, Chairman Pew asked that folks take a minute to introduce themselves to the group. Mr. Pew distributed a copy of the agenda that had been reviewed by the co-chairs earlier in the week and there was consensus that this would serve as a base for agendas for the remaining meetings. Mr. Pew then distributed a packet of proposed language for the group's consideration for items 2 – 7.

**Section #2 “The size, composition and appointment of the governing body”** was then considered. Following some discussion, it was agreed that the following clarifications/changes would be made:

Item #4 will include a statement that the weight of votes for Board members will be adjusted based on the biennial census figures for the RSU. Although this is currently the law, the group felt that this item would benefit from the addition of that language.

For example, the summary included later in Section 3 is accurate based on the 2000 census but would need to be reviewed once the 2010 census is complete.

Item #5 – The second paragraph will be changed to state, “A school operated within the regional school unit may not be closed unless closure of the school is approved at a regular or special meeting of the regional school unit board by an

affirmative vote of 85% of the elected membership or voting power of the regional school unit board,, with the exception of any schools that are closed by an existing SAU member of the RSU prior to the operations date of the RSU. Mr. Doyon and Ms. Arizzi both made statements about their concerns with some of the adjustments to the Governance issues asked to go on the record as being opposed to this change in Item #5.

Item #6 – The following language was added to the beginning of this item, “Except for as stated in Item #5 with regard to the vote to close a school...”

Item #7 – This will now read as follows,

“The RSU Board shall have the authority to designate other issues that will require a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority vote. That vote will require a 2/3 majority vote of the total membership of the full RSU Board.”

This reflects a change from the proposed language in this section to the original language used in item #5 of the packet distributed earlier in the meeting. Please note that clarification will be obtained from counsel as to whether the 2/3 majority vote can be based on the total number of votes allocated to all members of the RSU Board or whether it would be based on 2/3 of those present at a specific meeting. In either case, this language should suffice. This clarification will also be provided at the Oct. 23 meeting.

Following additional discussion, the group voted 19-2 to accept Section #2 with the above changes, (Holt, Motion; Taylor, second)

### **Section #3 “The method of voting of the governing body”**

Following a brief discussion around the importance of having representation from the 13 towns and plantations of the RSU on the governing board, the group voted unanimously to accept Section 3 as printed in the distributed packet.

(Arizzi, Motion; Taylor, second) Unanimous vote 21-0

### **Section #4 “The composition, powers and duties of any local school committees to be created”**

Following a lengthy discussion regarding the concern for local input on school issues and several motions, proposed amendments and withdrawal of same, it was decided to adopt the language used in the Sheepscott RSU plan.

The original amended vote made by Shaetzle and Nuttall to add a proposed "section d" to this language was withdrawn. A subsequent motion (Schaetzle, motion: Nuttall, second) to approve the Sheepscott Section 4 language in its original form passed by a 12-8 vote with one abstention.

Mr. Pew stated that he was hopeful that the group would be able to consider sections 5-7 at a minimum at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 P.M.

The next meeting will take place on Thursday, October 23 at 6:00 PM at the same location.

Respectfully Submitted.

David W. Murphy, Ed.D.

## **School Consolidation Minutes - October 23, 2008**

### **Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico**

RPC members in attendance: Ginny Nuttall, Paul Ferguson-Packard, Harold Schaetzle, Carmen Glidden, Rob Welch, Virgil Conkright, Ann Holt, Keith Farrington, Sid Pew, Lynn Arizzi, Roberta Taylor, Bonnie Largess, Jim Largess, Dennis Doyon, Dick Melville, Fred Henderson, Mary-Ellen Gartner, Marcel

Others in attendance, Bill Cumming, Facilitator, Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent, Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent, Eileen Adams, Lewiston Sun, Alison Aloisio, Bethel Citizen

Mr. Pew began the meeting at 6:00 P.M.

The first item of business was consideration of the minutes of the October 16 meeting. Copies were circulated (the minutes had been emailed earlier to all members). A motion was made by Keith Farrington and seconded by Ann Holt to accept the minutes as printed. The vote to do so was unanimous.

Mr. Pew turned the meeting over to co-chair Ginny Nuttall for a brief discussion about the goals of the committee. Views varied but efficiency, the ability to develop a plan that could be supported by the taxpayers and the importance of seeking quality educational experiences were all voiced as being important themes. Several members of the committee expressed their feeling that some type of transition plan would be important to the people in the SAU 37 area if voters there were going to be receptive to a consolidation plan.

Following this conversation, Mr. Pew returned to oversee the remaining agenda items.

~ A motion was made for reconsideration of Section 4. (Schaetzle/Deegan). Following conversation around the motion, a vote was taken. The final results of that vote saw the motion for reconsideration pass by a vote of 10-9 with one abstention.

A motion was then made to defer discussion of this item to the October 30 meeting (Bean/Schaetzle). This motion passed unanimously.

~ Section 5 was then considered. A motion was made and seconded (Farrington/Welch) to approve this section as written with the addition of a statement that reaffirmed the state law that returns closed schools/properties to their respective municipalities. Dave Murphy reminded the group that there

were variations of this rule when it came to buildings erected since the formation of an SAD but the process for those exceptions are also noted in law. The motion passed 18-2.

~ Following some discussion, sections 6 and 8 were tabled (Holt/B. Largess). It was decided that Mr. Clockedile would be asked to attend the October 30 meeting to explain these sections. The vote to table these sections was unanimous.

~ Section 9 was then considered. After some discussion, a motion was made and seconded (Nuttall/Dexter) to accept the language in the proposed article (without the portion that had been shown in italics). This motion passed 20-0.

~ Section 11 was then reviewed. A motion was made and seconded (Holt/Melville) to approve section 11 as printed. The vote to do so was unanimous. 20-0

~ Section 13-B was distributed and explained. Although some good conversation took place around this item, a motion to table was introduced (Bean/Dexter) due to the lateness of the hour. The motion to table section 13-B passed by a 15-5 vote.

Mr. Pew reminded the group that Sections 4,6,7,8,10,12 and 13-A and B still required the committee's action. He also asked that the committee be flexible with the date of the next meeting since Mr. Clockedile's calendar needs to be considered.

The meeting adjourned at 8:11 PM

The next meeting is currently scheduled for October 30, 2008 at 6:00 PM in the library at Mountain Valley High School.

Respectfully Submitted.

David W. Murphy, Ed.D.

## **School Consolidation Minutes - October 30, 2008**

### **Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico**

RPC members in attendance: Ginny Nuttall, Paul Ferguson-Packard, Harold Schaetzle, Carmen Glidden, Rob Welch, Virgil Conkright, Ann Holt, Keith Farrington, Sid Pew, Lynn Arizzi, Roberta Taylor, Bonnie Largess, Jim Largess, Dennis Doyon, Dick Melville, Fred Henderson, Mary-Ellen Gartner, Marcel Polak

Others in attendance, Bill Cumming, Facilitator, Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent, Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent, Eileen Adams, Lewiston Sun, Alison Aloisio, Bethel Citizen

Mr. Pew began the meeting at 6:00 P.M.

~ The first item of business was consideration of the minutes of the October 23 meeting. Copies were circulated (the minutes had been emailed earlier to all members). A motion was made by Ginny Nuttall and seconded by Roberta Taylor to accept the minutes as printed. The vote to do so was unanimous (18-0).

~ Following a brief discussion of the reconsideration of Section 4, a motion was made by Ginny Nuttall and seconded by Harold Schaetzle to move this item to the end of the agenda with the understanding that it would be considered prior to the end of the meeting. The motion to move the item to the end of the evening's agenda passed by 17-1 vote. Mr. Pew indicated that he would call for this article to be considered at 7:45.

~ Section 10 – Documentation of the Public Meetings was discussed briefly and approved unanimously as printed Farrington/Schaetzle (18-0)

~ A request was made by Superintendent Richardson for the group to consider establishing a referendum date for the RSU vote in January. A motion was made to add this item to the agenda. Ferguson-Packard/Holt. (18-0).

~ A motion was then made to establish January 27 as the date of the referendum. Welch/Taylor (18-0)

~ Section 13-B – Cost Sharing in the Regional School Unit was then discussed. Following some discussion about the proposed percentages and whether those percentages could be adjusted, some clarification of the item was provided by

the facilitator. A motion to amend was made by Jim Largess and seconded by Ann Holt to take out "periodically after" on page 2 and replace that language with "within". The amendment passed (17-1). The motion as amended was then voted on and passed.

Holt/B. Largess (17-1).

~ Section 6 was then considered. The committee reviewed and discussed this item. A motion was made (Arizzi/B. Largess) to accept the section as printed. Following some additional discussion, a motion to move the question was made (Holt/Doyon) and passed (18-0). The original motion was then considered and passed unanimously (18-0)

~ The group then reviewed Section 8. A motion was made to accept this section (Doyon Taylor) and the motion passed unanimously. (18-0)

~ A motion was made (Welch/Arizzi) to accept Section 7 as printed (Welch/Arizzi). Following some discussion and a review of the items include on this list, the section was approved. (18-0)

~ Mr. Welch moved and Ms. Largess seconded that Article 13-A be approved as written. Following a great deal of conversation that focused on the language included in this section, Ms. Arizzi made a motion to amend the article to state that a curriculum coordinator should also be included. This was seconded by Ms. Nuttall and the amendment passed. (16-2). The facilitator indicated that the items included under this section would be listed as recommendations for the new RSU Board but that the new RSU Board would ultimately make the final decisions around these positions. A motion to amend was then made (Arizzi/J. Largess) to change the number of boards in the first paragraph from 8 to 9. This was approved unanimously.

The group then addressed the proposed chart included in the original handout. Following a lengthy conversation, an amendment was made (Welch/Holt) to eliminate all information in the grid other than the titles of the positions and to amend "will" to "may" in seven places (see attached revised 13-A) The amendment passed. (16-1 with one abstention. The original motion (Welch/B. Largess), as amended, then passed (17-1)

~ Section 4 was then reconsidered (Nuttall/Schaetzle). Following some discussion, a motion was made to table this item until the Nov. 6 meeting. (Schaetzle/Nuttall). The motion to table passed (12-6).

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 PM

The next meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2008 at 6:00 PM in the library at Mountain Valley High School.

Respectfully Submitted.

David W. Murphy, Ed.D.

## **School Consolidation Minutes – November 6, 2008**

### **Mountain Valley High School Library, Mexico**

RPC members in attendance: Ginny Nuttall, Paul Ferguson-Packard, Harold Schaetzle, Carmen Glidden, Rob Welch, Virgil Conkright, Ann Holt, Keith Farrington, Sid Pew, Lynn Arizzi, Roberta Taylor, Bonnie Largess, Jim Largess, Ron Deegan, Dick Melville, Fred Henderson, Mary-Ellen Gartner, Beth Haley Smith, Bruce Bean, Linda Dexter

Others in attendance, Bill Cumming, Facilitator, Jake Clockedile, Facilitator, Phil Richardson, SAU 37 Superintendent, Dave Murphy, SAD 44 Superintendent, Eileen Adams, Lewiston Sun, Alison Aloisio, Bethel Citizen

Mr. Pew began the meeting at 6:00 P.M. Two packets of information were distributed. The first was a packet of information to be considered by the committee as agenda items for the evening. The second was a compilation of the sections of the consolidation plan that had been approved to date. Several other pieces of information, including a revised section 12, were also distributed separately.

~ The first item of business was consideration of the minutes of the October 30 meeting. Copies were circulated (the minutes had been emailed earlier to all members). A motion was made by Keith Farrington and seconded by Rob Welch to accept the minutes as printed. The vote to do so was unanimous.

~ Superintendent Murphy asked that the minutes of 10/23/08 be revisited to correct a typographical error that had been made earlier where the wrong section number had been referred to. Copies of the corrected version were distributed as part of the packet. The motion (Welch/Farrington) to approve as amended passed unanimously.

~ Superintendent Murphy informed the group that copies of the approved sections had been emailed to the DOE and to Drummond and Woodsum. Although the Boards have not formally acknowledged the plan, the reviews will be beneficial in helping us be able to move forward with final approval by the DOE.

~ As a result of the letter received by the Commissioner indicating that the DOE would not approve the 85% majority vote requirement previously approved by

the RSU committee as part of section 2, the following changes were made to that section:

~ The 85% language was changed to 2/3

~ A portion of a sentence on the second page was removed.

Following some discussion, a motion was made (Farrington/Arizzi) to approve the section as amended. This passed unanimously.

Another motion was then made (Welch/Dexter) to add the school closure policy adapted from the Maranacook proposal as an extension to part five of Section 2. Following some discussion, the motion passed 14-5.

~ Section 6 was then reconsidered. An amendment was offered (Nuttall/Welch) to include additional language to Section 6 of the RSU Plan:

The debt assigned to the Town of Rangeley as noted above shall be shared by all six (6) municipalities making up former Maine School Union#37 using the formula employed to determine the cost sharing of MSU#37's Office of the Superintendent. That formula based on data (Valuation and Number of students) for school year 2009-2010 is as follows:

> Dallas Plantation	14.88%
> Lincoln Plantation	1.48%
> Magalloway Plantation	1.70%
> Town of Rangeley	60.00%
> Rangeley Plantation	14.72%
> Sandy River Plantation	7.22%

The motion to amend passed unanimously 20-0.

~ A motion was made (Holt/Welch) to approve SAD #44 to serve as the Fiscal Agent for the RSU Planning Committee. This motion passed unanimously.

~ A discussion on Section 4 (Local School Committees) was placed on the table (Nuttall/Welch). A great deal of discussion followed on the pros and cons of establishing local school committees. After everyone had the opportunity to speak, the motion was put to a vote. The motion was defeated 12-8. As a result, the original language approved earlier by the committee continues to stand. This reflects the language created in the Sheepscot Valley plan.

~ Jake Clockedile, co-facilitator to the group, provided an overview of the proposed Cost Savings Estimate in Section 12. Following a slight revision and a

request to also add a spreadsheet that summarizes section 12 to the final plan, a motion was made (Holt/Melville) and passed unanimously.

~ Mr. Clockedile then addressed the remaining portions of Section 13. Following some discussion and the decision to add a sentence to Section 13-E to state that any costs and benefits resulting from the lawsuit described in that section would fall to SAU 37, a motion was made (Welch/Glidden) and passed unanimously.

~ No adjustments or revisions to any other portions of the plan were brought up by the group

~ A motion to approve the completed plan was made by Ann Holt and seconded by Bonnie Largess. The completed plan was approved unanimously, 20-0.

~ Superintendent Murphy reviewed the "next steps" for the SAUs including all SAU School Boards acknowledging the receipt of the plan and instructing the superintendents to forward it to the Commissioner for approval. Final copies of the total plan will be completed and distributed to the DOE and Drummond and Woodsum for initial review. Mr. Pew asked committee members to keep Thursday November 13 open in the event that adjustments to the plan are required. Committee members will be notified as soon as comments are received back from the DOE and the attorneys.

The group indicated that the co chairs, in consultation with the superintendents, could make any changes that were not deemed to be substantial. (The group did specifically provide the co chairs with the authority to submit the addendum included in the 11/06/08 packet, if additional information was required for Section 13-A). If substantial changes are needed, the group will reconvene.

Following rounds of thanks and congratulations, a motion to adjourn (Nuttall/Welch) passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

David W. Murphy, Ed.D.

"EXHIBIT E"

EXHIBIT 12 - A

ESTIMATION OF COST SAVINGS FROM CONSOLIDATION

RSU Function	Current Cost	Estimated Cost	Potential Savings
Central Office	\$ 329,500	\$ 337,000	(\$ 7,500)
Board Operations	\$ 67,427	\$ 57,677	\$10,750
Trans./Fac./Sped.	\$261,933	\$205,933	\$56,000
<b>Net Savings per year</b>			<b><u>\$59,250</u></b>
<u>Leveling Up Estimates</u>			
Teacher salaries	Moving to highest		\$94,000
Teacher benefits	Contract levels for estimates		\$68,000
Support staff salaries			\$63,000
Net Leveling Up Estimate			<b><u>\$225,000*</u></b>

\*Note: Leveling up costs are an estimate and will be dealt with through collective bargaining during the first three years of operation for the RSU. The consolidation law requires that the collective bargaining agreements that exist currently be transitioned into one agreement for each of the units that are formally organized for bargaining purposes.